

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated November 6, 2007, claim 9 was objected to; claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,748,005 (Riazi); claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riazi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,128,484 (Singkornrat); claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riazi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,280,583 (Nakayama); claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riazi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,867,223 (Schindler); claims 9, 10, 12-14, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riazi in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,200,649 (Batke); claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riazi in view of Batke and Singkornrat; claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riazi in view of Batke and Schindler; and claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riazi in view of Batke in view of Nakayama.

Claim 9 has been amended to address the objection.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Riazi.

As a preliminary note, it is respectfully submitted that the anticipation rejection of claim 1 over Riazi is improper in view of the concession made previously that Riazi fails to “teach data translation means, coupled between said computer display device and said monitor wireless transceiver,” in connection with claim 25. 1/29/2007 Office Action at 14. This constitutes an admission by the Examiner that Riazi does not disclose the translating of video data as recited in claim 1.

As purportedly disclosing “a display driver” as recited in claim 1, the Office Action cited column 6, lines 1-15, which provides the text corresponding to Fig. 8 of Riazi. The cited passage of Riazi refers to a video demodulator 110 receiving and demodulating video information sent from the base station 20. As argued by Applicant previously, a demodulator does **not** translate data. A demodulator is an electronic circuit used to recover or extract information modulated on a carrier wave or signal. *See, e.g.,* THE AMERICAN HERITAGE DICTIONARY<sup>®</sup> OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition (defining “demodulate” as “[t]o extract (information) from a modulated carrier wave”) (attached as Exhibit 1); Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary (defining “demodulate” as “to extract the information from (a modulated signal)”) (attached as Exhibit 2).

Therefore, all the demodulator 110 of Riazi is performing is extracting the video data from RF signals received from the base station 20 of Riazi. Extracting video data from a modulated carrier wave or signal, as performed by the demodulator 110 of Riazi, clearly does not constitute **translating** video data contained in wireless signals, as recited in claim 1.

In fact, a key teaching of Riazi that would indicate that no **translation** is being performed by the demodulator 110 of Riazi is the statement in column 6 of Riazi that the “video displayed on the display 14 [of the wireless handheld device depicted in Fig. 8 of Riazi] **replicates** the video which would be displayed by the local PC monitor 46 ....” Riazi, 6:1-2 (emphasis added). Thus, the statement that the video displayed on the display 14 **replicates** the video displayed by the local PC monitor 46, which is associated with the PC 30, strongly indicates that **no translation** is performed; otherwise, the replication of video on the PC monitor 46 and the handheld display device 14 would **not** be possible.

Therefore, the objective evidence of record establishes that Riazi does not disclose the subject matter of claim 1. In fact, this point was actually conceded by the Examiner in an earlier Office Action (1/29/2007 Office Action noted above).

Page 3 of the present Office Action further cited to Fig. 3 of U.S. Patent No. 5,877,745 (Beeteson). Specifically, the Office Action pointed to drive circuitry 21 depicted in Fig. 3 of Beeteson, and also pointed to column 3, lines 16-50, of Beeteson. The discussion of the drive circuitry 21 in Beeteson provides absolutely no teaching whatsoever of provision of a display driver in place of the demodulator 110 of Riazi. There is no teaching that the drive circuitry 21 of Beeteson is provided between a computer display device and a monitor wireless transceiver to perform the tasks recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the citation of Beeteson in the context of the § 102 rejection over Riazi is clearly improper. Beeteson was not referenced in Riazi, and therefore, the teachings of Beeteson cannot be considered as part of Riazi. If the Office Action is asserting that Beeteson would somehow be inherently part of Riazi, that is clearly not the case. There is absolutely no relationship between the drive circuitry 21 of Beeteson and the demodulator 110 of Riazi, where the demodulator 110 is used for extracting data from RF signals received by the demodulator 110. Moreover, the Office Action has provided absolutely no rationale regarding why the teachings of Beeteson would be inherently part of Riazi.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that claim 1 is not anticipated by Riazi.

Independent claim 25 is similarly allowable over Riazi.

Independent claim 9 was rejected as rejected as being obvious over Riazi in view of Batke. The Office Action conceded that Riazi fails to disclose the computer main unit having a unique address for wireless communication, and a monitor wireless transceiver configured to wirelessly communicate with a computer wireless transceiver, where the wireless communication includes data **and the unique address**. 11/6/2007 Office Action at 9. However, the Office Action cited Batke, and more specifically, to the following passages of Batke: column 13, lines 8-45; column 17, lines 15-67. It is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is non-obvious over the asserted combination of Riazi and Batke.

To make a determination under 35 U.S.C. § 103, several basic factual inquiries must be performed, including determining the scope and content of the prior art, and ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1965).

Here, the claimed subject matter of claim 9 differs significantly from the teachings of Riazi and Batke. As conceded by the Office Action, Riazi does not disclose wireless communication between a wireless computer monitor and a computer main unit, where the wireless communication includes data and a unique address of the computer main unit. Batke also fails to provide any such teaching, as Batke relates generally to communication over a network of IP packets, as depicted in Figs. 1 and 2 of Batke. General IP communication over networks, as taught by Batke, has absolutely no relevance to wireless communication between a wireless computer monitor and a computer wireless transceiver, where the wireless communication includes data and a unique address of the computer main unit. Therefore, even if Batke and Riazi could be properly combined, the hypothetical combination would not have led to the claimed invention.

Therefore, claim 9 is non-obvious over Riazi and Batke.

Dependent claims, including newly added dependent claims 28-30, are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims. Moreover, in view of the allowability of base claims, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejections of dependent claims have also been overcome.

Moreover, with respect to dependent claim 27, which was rejected as being obvious over Riazi and Schindler, it is respectfully submitted that the hypothetical combination of Riazi and Schindler would not have led to the claimed subject matter. Claim 27 recites first and second wireless monitors, where each of the first and second wireless computer monitors has a unique address for wireless communication, such that each of the first and second wireless computer monitors is configured to receive unique data from the computer wireless transceiver concurrently with the other of the first and second wireless computer monitors.

As conceded by the Office Action, Riazi does not disclose first and second wireless computer monitors, as recited in claim 27. 11/6/2007 Office Action at 8. Instead, the Office Action relied upon Schindler. Although Schindler discloses monitors 122 and 122' in Fig. 1A, and monitors 132 and 133 in Fig. 1B, note that the monitor 122 in Fig. 1A is connected by a monitor cable 120 to the personal computer 118. Moreover, the monitor 122 is connected over a cable to monitor 122'. Thus, there is absolutely no teaching in Fig. 1A of wireless communications between monitors 122, 122' and the personal computer 118.

Similarly, the monitors 132 and 133 are connected over a local area network 126 to the personal computer 118. There is absolutely no teaching of wireless communications between the monitors 132, 133, and the personal computer 118.

In view of the foregoing, even if Riazi and Schindler were to be hypothetically combined, the hypothetical combination would not have led to the subject matter of claim 27.

Newly added dependent claim 28 is also allowable over Riazi and Schindler, since the hypothetical combination of the references would not have led to the claimed subject matter of claim 28, which recites first and second wireless computer monitors to wirelessly communicate with the computer wireless transceiver.

Claim 21 depends from base claim 9, and further recites that a second wireless computer monitor has a unique address for wireless communication, where the second wireless computer monitor is configured to receive unique data and transmit unique data to the computer main unit in a wireless manner through the monitor wireless transceiver and computer wireless transceiver, concurrently with the first wireless computer monitor. This feature was conceded by the Office Action as not being disclosed by Riazi and Batke. 11/6/2007 Office Action at 11. However, the Office Action cited Schindler as disclosing this feature. As discussed above, there is no teaching

in Schindler of multiple wireless computer monitors communicating with the computer wireless transceiver coupled to the computer main unit.

Therefore, claim 21 is non-obvious over Riazi, Batke, and Schindler.

Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 (10015860-1).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*Feb. 6, 2008*



Dan C. Hu  
Registration No. 40,025  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
Telephone: (713) 468-8880  
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883